

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 26 2007

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTSRejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected the claims stating that "the phrase 'such as' renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention." *Office Action mailed 10/26/07, page 4, paragraph 2.*

Applicant has currently amended the present claims to delete the "such as" language and are relying on the disclosure in the specification to provide examples of the enumerated classes of aversive agents. The claims should now be allowable.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejection


Applicant traverses this rejection. The Examiner can issue a double patenting rejection only upon granted claims in a patent. Neither US '926 nor the present application have granted as a patent; therefore the Examiner should grant the present application.

CONCLUSION

Given the foregoing claim amendment and the fact that the '926 application has not been granted, Applicant respectfully requests that the present claims be granted.

Should the Examiner have any concerns regarding the application, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney

Respectfully submitted,



James G. Vouros  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,453  
Telephone No.: (215) 592-3410

Rohm and Haas Company  
100 Independence Mall West  
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399  
December 26, 2007